

danach an den Anfang des elamischen Tatenberichtes gesetzt, erscheint somit doppelt. Allerdings haben die elamischen Sekretäre den ersten Absatz für die große Inschrift in kanzleigerechtere Form gebracht. Die allererste Fassung dieses Absatzes 1 (in der Beischrift) habe ich bereits oben, in Anmerkung 6, in deutscher Übersetzung gegeben.

Die übrigen elamischen Beischriften beziehen sich auf die »Lügenkönige«. Sie sind bei den aufrecht stehenden Figuren unmittelbar über ihren Köpfen eingemeißelt. Die Beischrift des Magiers Gaumata befindet sich unmittelbar unter ihm. Diese Beischriften lauten auf deutsch:

1. Dieser Gaumata der Magier log: »Ich bin Smerdis, Sohn des Kyrus, ich übe die Königsherrschaft aus.«
2. Dieser Assina log: »Die Königsherrschaft in Elam übe ich aus.«
3. Dieser Nidit-Bēl log: »Ich bin Nebukadnezar, Sohn des Nabonēd; die Königsherrschaft in Babylonien übe ich aus.«
4. Dieser Frawartisch log: »Ich bin Chschathrita aus dem Geschlecht des Kyaxares, die Königsherrschaft in Medien übe ich aus.«
5. Dieser Martiya log: »Ich bin Ummanisch, die Königsherrschaft in Elam übe ich aus.«
6. Dieser Tschissantadima log: »Ich bin aus dem Geschlecht des Kyaxares, die Königsherrschaft in Sagartien übe ich aus.«
7. Dieser Wahyasdata log: »Ich bin Smerdis, der Sohn des Kyrus, ich übe die Königsherrschaft aus.«
8. Dieser Aracha log: »Ich bin Nebukadnezar, Sohn des Nabonēd, die Königsherrschaft in Babylonien übe ich aus.«
9. Dieser Frada log: »Ich übe die Königsherrschaft in der Margiana aus.«
10. Dies ist Skuncha der Skythe (Sake) [erst im Jahre 518 hinzugefügt].

Göttingen

Walther Hinz

AN ACHAEMENID SYMBOL*

I. A Farewell to »Fravahr« and »Ahuramazda«

Since the middle of the last century, Western scholars have insistently maintained that the representation in Achaemenid art of a winged-circle,¹ often with the addition of the upper part of a man dressed like a Persian king, symbolises Ahuramazda, the highest deity of the Iranians. This view is usually justified on the assumption that as the motif was borrowed from Assyria where it typified the supreme god, Assur, in Persia, too, it must have symbolised Ahuramazda, the Persian counterpart of Assur. The Iranians, on the other hand, are adamant in believing that the winged-figure represents the *fravahr* (Avestan *fravashi*, Modern Persian *frōhar*), often regarded as a sort of duplicate of the soul and the guardian angel of an individual.² In this they follow Parsi theologians who offer such an interpretation as a reaction, so to speak, to that proposed by Western scholars. Their reasonings are, however, inconclusive; consequently, the view held in the West has remained unaffected. In books and articles devoted to Iranian studies the winged-figure is now invariably referred to as Ahuramazda or his symbol, and that in spite of the fact that the plausibility of such an interpretation has never been proved. The purpose of this paper is to study the variety of forms and the patterns of occurrence of the "symbol", and to examine the validity of its identification with the *fravahr* or the symbol of Ahuramazda; arguments in favour of an alternative interpretation will be offered in a forthcoming article.

It has long been recognised that the winged-circle is of Egyptian origin.³ In Egypt it evidently represented "Horus, the sky- and sun-god who was immanent in Pharaoh and manifest in the form of a falcon".⁴ A number of Western Asiatic people borrowed the motif with minor changes.⁵ The Assyrians, for example, put the upper part of a bearded man, often carrying a bow, into the circle. This Assyrianised form is usually taken to represent the national god Assur.⁶ With the rise of the Achaemenids, the

* Many thanks are due to Professor M. Boyce and Professor R. N. Frye, from whose criticisms and suggestions this paper has benefitted greatly.

¹ It should be observed that the motif is a large ring adorned with a pair of wings and from which the human figure, if present, emerges; it is therefore not a winged-disc or winged-globe, as modern commentators call it, but a winged-circle, as earlier writers observed.

² Originally, *fravahrs* were evidently the departed souls of the ancestors.

³ A. H. Layard, *Nineveh and its Monuments* II (1850), 448; G. Rawlinson, tr. of Herodotus' *Historiae* I (1858) 270; A. B. Cook, *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion*, I (1914) 205-206; H. Frankfort, *Cylinder Seals* (1939) 207 ff.; E. D. van Buren, *Symbols of the Gods in Mesopotamian Art* (1954) 94 f.

⁴ H. Frankfort, *The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient* (1963), 117.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 66 (the Assyrians); 117, 245 n. 15 (the Hittites); 247 n. 45 (the North Syrians) etc.

⁶ But B. Perring in *AFO* 8, 1932/33, 281 ff., suggests that it might have symbolised Ninurta.

Persians became acquainted with the winged-circle and its Assyrian successor. Various forms of the motif are shown on Achaemenid reliefs, seals, *bullae* and a few satrapal coins. The most frequently occurring type consists of a half-length human figure with eagle's wings, tail and legs. The human figure is invariably a man attired in a robe and a crown like a Persian king; he emerges from a circle, raising one hand in the attitude of benediction, and holding a ring with the other. Sometimes the motif is simplified, consisting of a circle with eagle's wings, tail and legs. A more elaborate variation shows a man with four wings, but this type is relatively rare.

The winged-figure (by which is here meant either the winged-circle or the winged-human) is usually depicted as hovering above persons or, occasionally, over animals. Only in a few instances does it appear unaccompanied by any other figures. Of these, one example is represented on a fragmentary bronze throne-leg from Van, dating from the Achaemenid period (now in the British Museum);⁸ and another is shown on certain coins of the Persian satrap Tiribazus (c. 380 B.C.) which were minted somewhere in Cilicia.⁹ The usual place of the motif is above scenes involving Iranians engaged in various occupations such, for example, as hunting, fighting, or attending occasions of state or rituals. In both hunting and ritual scenes, supernatural beings, such as composite monsters and genii, may appear as participants. In all these representations, the winged-figure occupies the centre of the upper part of the scenes; occasionally, however, it is shown in a lower part of the picture, encircled by a large ring,¹⁰ or even held by a foreign deity such as Ba'al.¹¹ In some instances, a pair of composite animals, such as winged human-headed bulls, are seen upholding the symbol in the same way as the representatives of the subject nations uphold, on Achaemenid sculpture, the throne of the Great King. In the scenes depicting Persian monarchs the motif is usually a winged-circle from which the bust of a man, almost identical with the royal figures, emerges. However, when ordinary Iranians are shown, the human bust is normally absent. In more elaborate scenes, such as those representing a king and his retinue, or the Immortals vanquishing their enemies, both types may appear simultaneously.

The frequent occurrence of the winged-figure in Achaemenid art shows the importance which it held in the religious and social beliefs of the Persians. It hardly admits of any doubts that the various forms of the motif represented a certain power primarily concerned with the Great Kings. There is no direct evidence as to the meaning and function of the symbol, yet no less than three different interpretations have so far been proposed, namely, that it symbolises:

a The *fravahr* of the king above whom it hovers,

⁷ In J. Boardman's *Greek Gems and Finger rings* (1970) the winged-circle appears hovering above a horse (pl. 831), a lion (pl. 903) and a dog or lynx (pl. 833).

⁸ E. Herzfeld, *Iran in the Ancient East* (1941) 263 and fig. 364.

⁹ G. F. Hill, *Cat. of the Greek Coins of Lycania, Isauria and Cilicia* (1900) pl. XXVI 2 and pl. XXXIX 1.

¹⁰ A Survey of the Persian Art ed. A. U. Pope Pl. 123 D.

¹¹ On a coin (from Tarsos?) now in the British Museum, see S. Robinson, *Numismatic Chronicle* 1948, 59 and pl. V, 12.

b Ahuramazda, and

c The *Khwarenah* "Glory, Fortune" of the Iranian king or nation.

Let us consider each of these interpretations on its own merits (the last one will be discussed in a separate article).

a The *fravahr* theory

The view that the winged-figure stands for the *fravahr* of the king with whom it is associated goes back to the second half of the eighteenth century, when publication of the Zoroastrian scriptures and ancient Persian monuments aroused great interest in Europe for Iranian studies. To a scholar well acquainted with Zoroastrian literature and Sasanian rock-reliefs, the winged-figure suggested not the head of the Mazdean pantheon but the *fravahr* of the Persian king.¹² It was argued that the symbol appears above all royal figures, and that it occupies the same position as does the winged figure in human form upon Sasanian monuments which, consequently, must be its successor.¹³ Apart from these general considerations, however, no direct evidence was adduced in favour of this theory. Yet it gained wide-spread acceptance¹⁴, especially amongst the Paris and, subsequently, the Iranians. Later, Lily Ross Tylor and J. M. Unvala revived it as a response to the "symbol of Ahuramazda" theory. Having referred to Herodotus' testimony (I, 131) that the Persians had no images of their gods, Tylor interpreted the winged-figure as representing the *daimon* of the Persian kings which is mentioned by Theopompus (ap. Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistia*, VI, 252 [60]) and Plutarch (*Artaxerxes*, 15), and which she identified with the *fravahr* of the royal individuals.¹⁵ Unvala also cited Herodotus (I, 131), and argued that Zoroastrian literature and tradition know nothing about any images of Ahuramazda, and that not a single inscription clearly referring to a representation of the Supreme God has hitherto been discovered.¹⁶ He further pointed out that, according to the *Avesta* (Yasna XXXVI, 3, 6), Ahuramazda's symbols were fire and the sun, which in no way bear any similarity to a winged-figure.¹⁷ In stating the *fravahr* theory anew, Unvala referred to Yasht XIII, 23, 26, 69-70, where the *fravahrs* are described as swiftly flying to the aid of the warriors who invoke them for victory, and "particularly to the aid of a well-ruling king who is surprised by a harmful enemy, in the shape of well-winged man-like birds". Noting

¹² A. I. Silvestre De Sacy, *Memoires sur diverses antiquités de Perse, et sur la médailles des rois de la dynastie de Sassanides* (Paris 1793) 268.

¹³ M. Dieulafoy, *L'acropole de Susé, d'après les fouilles exécutées en 1884-86, sous les auspices du Musée de Louvre* (1893) 406-408.

¹⁴ De Sacy's followers include: Sir W. Ouseley, *Travels in Various Countries of the East II* (London 1821) 269-70; Ch. Texier, *Description de l'Arménie, la Perse et la Mésopotamie* (Paris 1852) II 222; J. Fergusson, *The Palaces of Nineveh and Persepolis* (London 1851) 126; W. S. W. Vaux, *Nineveh and Persepolis* (London 1850) 100, 371.

¹⁵ "The 'Proskynesis' and the Hellenistic Ruler Cult," *JHS* 47, 1927, 53-62, esp. 56.

¹⁶ "The Winged Disk and the Winged-human figure on Ancient Persian Monuments," *Modi Memorial Volume* (Bombay 1930) 488-513, esp. 493.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 502.

that the first appearance in Persian art of the winged-figure is on the Behistun record-relief which commemorated Darius' victories, and maintaining that the motif is usually identical with the king above whom it hovers not only in features, headdress and costumes, but also in gestures, Unvala concluded that Darius had represented his *fravahr* "which had taken an active part invisibly in his battles with the pretenders..."¹⁸

The *fravahr* interpretation is interesting but not convincing. Firstly, the word *fravashi* (older form *fraorati*) is a feminine noun,¹⁹ which indicates that the *fravashi* was imagined to be female, whereas these Achaemenid figures show the bust of a man emerging from the circle. Secondly, the motif appears, though rarely, independently, and with no apparent connexion with a Persian king. Thirdly, its representations fail to suggest the very function which Unvala attributes to it, namely assisting warriors in the midst of battles, since nowhere does it appear as carrying arms or taking part in combats. It must be emphasised that the figure is borrowed from Assyria, where it frequently appeared as a warrior equipped with a bow and arrows. Had the Persians intended to represent warrior *fravahrs*, they had the archer-Assur as a perfect example to copy. Fourthly, one can hardly expect the *fravahrs* to have assumed different forms, as these representations suggest. It is harder still to explain why in some instances the winged-circle appears *together* with the winged human. Besides, if the *fravahr* of a king was represented as a duplicate of that royal personage, one would expect the *fravahr* of a Magus to have been depicted as a priest, or that of a lion to resemble such an animal. These considerations oblige us to abandon the *fravahr* theory.

b The "Symbol of Ahuramazda" hypothesis

So far as I know, J. G. Rhode was the first to assert the view that the winged-figure symbolises Ahuramazda.²⁰ He argued that the interpretation of the winged-figure as the *fravahr* was not convincing, as it was based on the mistaken assumption that the *fravahr* of a human being was independent from him and accompanied him like a guardian angel, whereas the *fravahr* is the very Soul of a man and inseparable from him as long as he lives. Thus:

"Die über dem Könige schwebende Gestalt kann also nicht sein Feuer, sondern muß ein anderes geistiges Wesen, einen Ized oder Amschaspand darstellen sollen".²¹ Rhode then interpreted the ring held by the winged-figure as the symbol of the Sun, which itself was considered as a deity, and argued that only Ahuramazda could have been represented as holding such a divinity in his hand.²²

¹⁸ Unvala, op. cit. 494.

¹⁹ I. Gershevitich, *The Avestan Hymn to Mithra* (1959) 162-63.

²⁰ *Die heilige Sage und das gesammte Religion der alten Baktrer, Meder, Perser, & c.*, (Frankfort 1820)

²¹ *Ibid.* 486.

²² *Ibid.* 485 f.

²³ *Ibid.*, 486-87.

For nearly thirty years this interpretation was ignored while that proposed by De Sacy prevailed; then in 1850, Austen Henry Layard re-asserted it, evidently unaware that Rhode had anticipated him. The way in which this view was stated and elaborated and then presented as an established, unassailable fact is quite interesting. Contrary to what is generally supposed, the winged-figure was not interpreted as the symbol of Ahuramazda on the ground that it was found to be analogous to the representation of Assur in Assyrian art. Far from it, Layard "discovered", so to speak, the symbol of an Assyrian great god by analogy with what he *had already presumed* to be the representation of Ahuramazda in Persian sculpture. In other words, he was not concerned at all with providing an interpretation for the Persian winged-figure - that he had unhesitatingly taken as the symbol of Ahuramazda. Rather, he was anxious to establish the meaning of the Assyrian winged-figure by basing his argument on parallelism in Persian and Assyrian art. He starts with the general observation that:

"The symbols and religious ceremonies represented at Khorsabad and Kouyunjik, and on the cylinders, are identical with those of the ancient monuments of Persia; at the same time, the sculptures of Persepolis, in their mythic character, resemble in every respect those of the Assyrians. We have the same types and groups to embody ideas of the divinity and to convey sacred subjects. When the close connexion, in early ages, between religion and art is borne in mind, it will be at once conceded, that a nation like the Persians would not borrow mere forms without attaching to them their original signification. If even this were not, as a general rule, the case, there is still at Persepolis sufficient to prove that the religious symbols of the Persians were adopted from the Assyrians. The form of supreme deity (the winged figure within the circle), and the types of wisdom and power, are precisely similar on the monuments of both people."²³

Then Layard proceeds to investigate the meaning of the winged-figure:

"The winged figure in the circle constantly occurs on the walls of Persepolis, and on Persian monuments of the Achaemenian dynasty, as that of the supreme divinity... We may conclude from the prominent position always given to this figure in the Nimrud sculptures, and from its occurrence on Persian monuments as the representation of Ormuzd, that it was also the type of the supreme deity amongst the Assyrians."²⁴

Layard does not know "the name by which the divinity was known", but he conjectures that it was Ba'1.²⁵ Thus far the genesis of the "Ahuramaz Symbol". An interpretation based on an unsupported surmise hardly deserved to win the unwanted enthusiastic adherence of so many scholars for so long a time; yet, soon the "Symbol of Ahuramazda" or "*Ahuramazdas Bild*" began to make regular appearances in

²³ *Nineveh and its Monuments II* (London 1850) 440 f.

²⁴ *Ibid.* 449.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

literature.²⁶ It is interesting to note that, of all those who followed this interpretation, G. Rawlinson was the only scholar, so far as I know, to provide it with supporting arguments. It was *he* who first argued:

"The winged circle, with or without the addition of a human figure, which was in Assyria the emblem of the chief Assyrian deity, Asshur, became with the Persian the ordinary representation of the Supreme God, Ormuzd, and, as such, was placed in most conspicuous positions on their rock tombs and on their buildings."²⁷

Almost incidentally, Rawlinson gave a stronger reason for such an interpretation. By noting that in scenes where the winged-figure and the disc representing "Mithra, or the Sun" occur together, "the position of the former is central, that of the latter towards the right hand of the tablet",²⁸ he implied that the higher position of the winged-figure suggests that it represented a deity more important than Mithra, and, therefore, Ahuramazda himself.

In any event, by the turn of the century, the terms "Ahuramazda" and the "Symbol of Ahuramazda" had become the established designations of the winged-figure, and all doubts and reservations as to their plausibility were abandoned in the West. It is small wonder, therefore, that a contemporary scholar has deemed it fit to regard the case as closed by remarking:

"Only the Parsees may still entertain doubts on this identification. Their sole argument is that the great god Ahura Mazda cannot be represented. But they cannot but admit that he was represented on Sasanid reliefs, and already on Kushan coins... Nothing, therefore, prevents us from admitting that it was he, the sky-god, who succeeded the god Assur on the Assyrian figurations."²⁹

Universally accepted though it may be, the "Symbol of Ahuramazda" hypothesis rests on shaky foundations and is open to serious objections. It has in its favour only the arguments stated and implied by G. Rawlinson. To take the better argument first. If the "orb" in the right-hand side of the scene was indeed the representation of Mithra, one had to admit that the Achaemenids did represent their deities, and that the god shown in a position more conspicuous than that of Mithra could only be Ahuramazda. This, however, cannot be the case, as the motif is not a simple orb, but a crescent combined with a disc. It therefore stands for both the Sun³⁰ and the Moon. That they should be placed in the right hand-side of the scene is natural enough, since they rise from the east. The difference in position is thus conditioned not by the degree of religious importance but by a tendency for realistic representation. On the other hand,

²⁶ Idem, *Discoveries in the Ruins of Nineveh and Babylon* (1853), 607, 608; M. A. Levy in *ZDMG* 21, 1866, 426, 430 f.; Fr. Spiegel, *Eranische Altertumskunde* II (1873) 24 f.

²⁷ *The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World* (1871 ed.) III 351.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 352.

²⁹ J. Duchesne-Guillemin, *Symbols and Values in Zoroastrianism* (1966) 91 n. 8.

³⁰ Rawlinson, *op. cit.* 352 himself pointed out that in Persia the Sun orb is not "four-rayed like the Assyrian, but perfectly plain and simple."

while the winged-figure occupies the centre of the sculptured panel, the Sun-and-Moon symbol is placed in the uppermost part of the scene, suggesting thereby that it is in fact given a more elevated position than the former. Consequently, if the difference of position is indicative of varying degree of importance, one has to concede that the Sun-and-Moon symbol – which occupies a higher level – must have had a higher religious significance than the winged-figure; hence, the latter cannot justifiably be interpreted as the symbol of the Supreme God.

Rawlinson's other argument is in fact based on an assumption rather than seriously reasoned; for the idea that a borrowed symbol carries with it its original significance is not always true. If this line of argument were followed, one would have to admit that either the Egyptian winged-figure typified the Supreme god Ammon and not Horus, or else that the Assyrian motif stood not for Assur but for Shamash, the Assyrian counterpart of the Egyptian Horus. It can be shown that the similar representations could have different connotations for different people. For instance, the Achaemenids imitated from their Oriental predecessors the idea of "Procession of tribute bearers" to represent on the Persepolitan reliefs "Procession of gift bearers".³¹

The Persian satrap Tissaphernes copied in c. 413 B.C. the Athenian Tetradrachm in weight and reverse type evidently for political reasons, and no one claims that he accepted the significance of Athena's owl as well.³² The Parthians went further. They depicted on their coins the figure of Arsaces, the eponymous founder of their royal house, seated on the famous omphalos of Delphi where the Hellenic Apollo used to sit; and they have not as yet been accused of having intended to identify Arsaces with Apollo. Nothing, therefore, obliges us to take it for granted that the Achaemenids borrowed the symbol of Assur – if indeed it is the symbol of Assur – to represent their own national deity.

As for the objections to the "Symbol of Ahuramazda" theory, it will be seen that it contradicts the evidence not only of Herodotus but also of other sources, it fails to account for the variety of forms of the motif, it does not explain why the Supreme God of a ruling nation is sometimes given a subordinate position, and it ignores the fact that the motif bears no resemblance to the known representations of Ahuramazda in Iranian art. Let us consider these points in some detail.

1 Herodotus expressly testifies that the Persians had no images of the gods, and regarded the use of them as a sign of folly (I, 131). The identification of the winged-figure with Ahuramazda is thus inconsistent with a first-hand report by a contemporary historian who is otherwise usually considered to be remarkably accurate and well-informed. Indeed, Herodotus' statement is confirmed by at least two other Classical authors, Dinon and Berosus. The former was a contemporary of Alexander and the author of a *Persica* (now lost) which Cornelius Nepos described as the best authority on the subject (*Conon*, 5). He is quoted by Clement of Alexandria as saying

³¹ This is clearly shown by G. Walser, *Die Völkerschaften auf den Reliefs von Persepolis* (1966) 22 ff.

³² For the coin see S. Robinson, "Greek Coins acquired by the British Museum 1938-48 I," *Numismatic Chronicle* 1948, 43-65, and pl. V, 8, SA. See also below n. 37.

that the Magi "sacrifice under the open sky, believing that fire and water are the sole emblems of divinity".³³ Dinon's evidence implies that, like other deities, Ahuramazda was not represented independently, but could be symbolised by the fire and the Sun. The second writer, Berosus, was a priest of Marduk at Babylon in the time of Antiochus I (281-61 B.C.), and was well-informed in the ancient history of Western Asia. Quoted by the same Clement, he informs us that idolatry was introduced by Artaxerxes II (404-359), who set up images of Anāhitā (no other deity is mentioned) in various cities:

"It was not, however, till many ages had passed that they (i.e., the Persians) began to worship statues in human forms, as Berosus shows in his third book of *Chaldaean History*; for this was introduced by Artaxerxes the son of Darius and father of Ochus, who was the first to set up the statue of Aphrodite Anaitis in Babylon, Susa and Ecbatana, and to enjoin this worship upon the Persians and Bactrians, upon Damascus and Sardis".³⁴

The testimony of Berosus is quite consistent with the inscriptional evidence indicating the prominent position of Anāhitā in the time of Artaxerxes II.³⁵ It is interesting to note that while a vivid description of Anāhitā in the *Ābān Yasht* suggests a sculptural source, there is no description of Ahuramazda in the older part of the *Avesta* which points to a pictorial origin.

2 The theory ignores the fact that the form of the motif varies in accordance with the setting in which it occurs; thus it is usually a winged-human when hovering above a king or his personal body guards, and a winged-circle when above princes or ordinary Iranians. This inconsistency suggests that there were *two* symbols, one peculiar to the Great Kings and one associated with the Iranians in general. As Ahuramazda was, according to Darius,³⁶ "the god of the Aryans", it cannot be maintained that the winged-human typifies a Royal Achaemenid Ahuramazda while the winged-circle stands for an Iranian Ahuramazda. The two forms of the motif must, therefore, represent not Ahuramazda but two divine powers one of which was directly associated with the Great Kings.

3 The patterns of occurrence of the motif show that it could not have been the symbol of the Supreme God. For while one of his representations, the fire, is always accompanied by worshippers, as indeed it should have been, the "supposed" Ahuramazda appears alone, as on the bronze throne-leg from Van, or as a secondary small figure, as on a dagger-sheath from the Oxus treasure and the Cilician coin which shows the enthroned Semitic god, Baʿl, holding the winged-figure.³⁷ Furthermore, one does not expect the Supreme God to appear as protected by soldiers or genii.

³³ Exhortation of the Greek, G. W. Butterworth, Loeb ed., London (1919), 147.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ R. G. Kent, *Old Persian* (2nd ed. 1953) 154.

³⁶ Behistun, Elamite version IV 62; cf. R. N. Frye, *The Heritage of Persia* (1962) 94.

³⁷ See above, 14 n. I. Robinson calls the motif "an anch."

4 The "Symbol of Ahuramazda" theory is inconsistent with the fact that there are representations of Ahuramazda in Iranian art, often labelled so that there could be no question as to his identity. The oldest of these dates from the middle of the first century, B.C., when Antiochus of Commagene, who claimed descent from the Achaemenids, showed on Nimrud Dagh stela prominent Iranian gods identified with their Greek counterparts. On the west terrace of his tomb, there is an sculpture representing Zeus-Oromasdes as a bearded man wearing a conical hat and holding the Zoroastrian *barsom* twigs.³⁸ The Kushans, an Iranian people who ruled over what is now Pakistan from A.D. 50 to 250, worshipped Iranian gods combined with Greek deities.³⁹ But they seem to have been reluctant to personify the Supreme God, Ahuramazda, whom they called Oromozdo or Mozdoano (Mazda the Triumphant), since he seldom appears on their coins. One certain example is on some coins of Huvishka, where the deity is depicted as a bearded man standing, holding with the right hand a wreath and with the left a staff which, by analogy with other known representations of Ahuramazda, can be interpreted as a bundle of the *barsom* twigs.⁴⁰ The deity is also shown on Sasanian reliefs, both as a horseman and afoot. He appears in investiture scenes, wearing a battlemented crown and holding a ring adorned with royal diadem in the one hand and a long bundle of the *barsom* twigs in the other.⁴¹

It will be seen that in none of these representations is there any sign of an eagle's wings, tail, or leg. On the contrary, the god always appears, naturally enough, as a Mazdaean priest, whose attribute is not a lotus flower but the *barsom* twigs. More significant is the fact that he always takes an active part in the scene in which he appears, whereas the Achaemenid winged-figure never participates in an investiture or any other event, but, exactly like the Hellenistic Tyche on the Sasanian triumph reliefs, hovers above the Great King and is detached from the scene itself. It scarcely needs arguing that once established, the features of a god, and that the Supreme God, remain constant through ages.⁴² How are we, then, to explain the remarkable difference in the appearance of the Supreme God if we accept the interpretation of the winged-figure as the "Symbol of Ahuramazda"? It cannot be maintained that Antiochus or Ardashir were not acquainted with the winged-figure, as the former was a contemporary of the kings of Persis on whose coins the motif frequently occurred, and the latter knew Persepolis well.⁴³ It will be recalled that both of these kings claimed descent from the Achaemenids; they were, therefore, careful to retain or even revive any religious or political ideas related to their claims,⁴⁴ and above such conceptions

³⁸ R. Ghirshman, *Iran: Parthians and Sassanians* (1962) Illust. no. 60.

³⁹ J. M. Rosenfield, *The Dynastic Art of the Kushans* (1967) 59 ff.

⁴⁰ Ghirshman, op. cit. Illust. nos. 167, 168, 202, 211.

⁴¹ Rosenfield, op. cit. 83.

⁴² Cf. E. Herzfeld, *Iran in the Ancient East* (1941) 328-29.

⁴³ Several graffiti representing Ardashir's father and elder brother still exist on the walls of Persepolis, see Herzfeld, op. cit. 308, and E. F. Schmidt, *Persepolis I* (1951) 227 f. 258.

⁴⁴ Cf. what is said of another claimant of the Achaemenid descent, Mithridates VI of Pontus: after his victory over Murena (82 B.C.), he "offered sacrifice to Zeus Stratus on a lofty pile of wood, according

stood the view that the kingship was bestowed upon an Iranian king by Ahuramazda. If the winged-figure were the standard representation of the Supreme God, neither Antiochus nor Artashir would have committed the harmful and totally unnecessary heresy of showing him so differently from his traditionally established appearance.

Thus, when all considerations are taken into account, there remain no grounds for interpreting the two Achaemenid symbols, the winged-human and the winged-circle, as the representations of Ahuramazda.

Shiraz

A. Sh. Shabbazi

to the fashion of his country," and performed the rites "as at the sacrifice of the Persian kings at Pasargadae," Appian, Mithridatic War, IX, 66.

DIE KOPFBEDECKUNG DES PERSISCHEN ORNATS BEI DEN ACHÄMENIDEN

(Taf. 31-36)

Seit der wichtigen Abhandlung Hans-Werner Ritters¹ wissen wir Genaueres über die Insignien der persischen Könige und daß es zwei verschiedene Ornate gegeben hat, das medische und das persische, die jeweils zu verschiedenen Anlässen getragen wurden.

Das medische Ornat wurde, wie das Alexandermosaik aus der Casa del Fauno in Pompeji² am besten zeigt, vor allem im Felde getragen, während die persische Tracht in erster Linie zeremoniellen Anlässen vorbehalten war.

Das medische Ornat besteht nach seiner ausführlichsten Beschreibung bei Xenophon (Kyrou. VIII 3, 13) aus der *Tiara orthè*, der aufrechten Tiara, mit dem darum geschlungenen Diadem, dem medischen Ärmelchiton, dem *Sarapis* bei Pollux (VII 61)³, der purpurfarben war und – wie wir auf dem Alexandermosaik sehen – einen weißen Brustbesatz hatte⁴. Über die Schulter war – mit herabhängenden Ärmeln – der ganz mit Purpur gefärbte Mantel geworfen, der *Kandys*⁵, die Beine waren mit scharlach-

¹ Neben den Abkürzungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (s. AA. 1968, 809 ff.) werden hier noch folgende verwendet:

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Babelon, Perses | = E. Babelon, Les Perses Achéménides, Paris 1893 |
| Dalton | = O. M. Dalton, The Treasure of the Oxus with other Examples of early Oriental Metal-Work ² , London 1964 |
| Herzfeld, IAE | = E. Herzfeld, Iran in the Ancient East, London-New York 1940 |
| Hinz, AFF. | = W. Hinz, Altiranische Funde und Forschungen, Berlin 1969 |
| Persepolis I, II, III | = E. F. Schmidt, Persepolis I (OIP LXVIII, 1953) ders., Persepolis II (OIP LXIX, 1957) und ders., Persepolis III (OIP LXX, 1970) |
| Pražek | = J. V. Pražek, Geschichte der Meder und Perser bis zur makedonischen Eroberung I u. II, Göttingen 1906 und 1910, Repr. Stuttgart 1968 |
| Ritter | = H.-W. Ritter, Diadem und Königsherrschaft (= Vestigia, Beiträge zur alten Geschichte 7, 1965) |
| Tilia | = A. B. Tilia, Studies and Restorations at Persepolis and other Sites of Fars (= IsMEO Reports and Memoirs XVI, 1972) |
| Tritsch | = Tritsch, JHS. 62, 1942, 105 f. |

² F. Winter, Das Alexandermosaik aus Pompeji; K. Scheffold, Die Griechen und ihre Nachbarn = Propyläen Kunstgeschichte I Taf. 244 Farbtaf. XXIV.

³ Vgl. dazu G. Widengren, Arctica (Stud. Ethn. Upsal. 11) 238; Hinz, AFF 72. 74.

⁴ Fuhrmann, Philoxenos von Eretria 317 und schon E. Neuffer, Das Kostüm Alexanders d. Gr. (Diss. Gießen 1929) 32.

⁵ Dieses Kleidungsstück hat man in einem in der polnischen Volkstracht vorkommenden Überwurf mit Namen Kontusch wiedererkannt und auf ein altpersisches Wort kantusch geschlossen, vgl. Widengren a. O. 237 und Hinz AFF 74. Zum Schnitt des polnischen Kontusch s. M. Tilke, Kostümschnitte und Gewandformen Taf. 40, 3. Auch der ungarische Hirtenmantel szür scheint denselben eurasischen Ursprung zu haben, s. V. Gervers-Molnar, The Hungarian Szür, An Archaic Mantle of Eurasian Origin (= Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, History, Technology and Art Monograph Nr. 1, 1973). – Zu den osteuropäischen Völkern scheint diese Mantelform über die nordiranischen Sarmaten gelangt zu sein. Ein sarmatischer Stamm ist wohl gemeint mit der rechten huldigenden Völkerschaft auf der Westseite des Theodosius-Obeliskens in Istanbul, die offenbar aus Pelz bestehende Ärmelmäntel trägt, vgl. schon Gervers-Molnar